REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are currently pending, Claims 13-14 having been added. The changes and additions to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed specification, for example, on page 17, lines 5-21; and Fig. 1.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 6-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0154187, hereafter "Hayakawa") in view of Hu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143727, hereafter "Hu") and Srinivasan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,856 hereafter "Srinivasan"); Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa in view of Hu, Srinivasan, and Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,401); Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa in view of Hu, Srinivasan, and Gautam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,704, hereafter "Gautam").

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

> requesting that an update-information providing apparatus provide update-information about a latest version of a program used for the content data on the communication terminal and update information about a database schema which includes instructions on how to modify a database schema already used by the communication terminal to a database schema corresponding to the latest version, the database schema indicating what types of information related to the content data can be stored in the database for each of the plurality of content data and indicating a configuration for storing the types of information related to the content data in the database for each of the plurality of content data in the format of a table;
>
> receiving the update-information about the program and the update-information about the database schema,

both transmitted from the update-information providing apparatus in response to the request;

updating the program in accordance with the update-information about the program;

comparing the database schema used by the updated program with the database schema already used by the communication terminal, in accordance with the update-information about the database schema, in terms of version; and

updating the database schema used by the communication terminal, in accordance with the update-information about the database schema, when it is determined in the comparing that the database schema needs to be updated, wherein updating the database schema includes at least modifying a number of columns in the table format of the database schema while the plurality of content data remains stored in the database.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of amended Claim 1.

As previously presented, Hayakawa is directed to a method of synchronizing application data stored in databases of a plurality of information processing devices. Also previously presented, Hu is directed to converting the Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine Structured Reporting (DICOM SR) standard to a set of Extensible Markup Language (XML) Document Type Definitions (DTDs) and XML Schemas (see para. [0004] and [0010] of Hu).

The Office Action acknowledges that Hayakawa and Hu fail to disclose or suggest "a database schema which includes instructions on how to modify a database schema already used by the communication terminal to and indicating a configuration for storing the types of information related to the content data in the database for each of the plurality of content data." (See Office Action, at pages 5-6).

Thus, the Office Action relies on <u>Srinivasan</u> as disclosing "wherein updating the database schema includes at least modifying a number of columns in the table format of the database schema while the plurality of content data remains stored in the database." (See Office Action, at page 6, citing col. 6, lines 26-30 of <u>Srinivasan</u>).

<u>Srinivasan</u> is directed to a method for representing objects in a relational database. <u>Srinivasan</u> describes an attribute store table as shown in Fig. 4 which has four columns ("EID", "AttrName", "AttrVal" and "AttrKind"). The rows in Fig. 4 define metadata entries referred to as "subschema entries," and <u>Srinivasan</u> describes that *new rows* may be inserted into the table (see col. 6, lines 37-39).

However, in Fig. 4, it is clear that the columns are "EID", "AttrName", "AttrVal" and "AttrKind", while the content data is the metadata entries stored in the table. The number of columns is not modified in <u>Srinivasan</u>, and the entry of a new row in table 4 of <u>Srinivasan</u> involves adding new content data to the database.

Therefore, Applicants submit that <u>Srinivasan</u> clearly fails to disclose or suggest "modifying a number of *columns* in the table format of the database schema *while the plurality of content data remains stored in the database*," as required by Claim 1. On the contrary, Srinivasan describes the opposite of this since it involves modifying the content (i.e., adding new metadata by adding new rows) while the number of columns remains unchanged.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Srinivasan</u> fails to remedy the deficiencies of <u>Hayakawa</u> and <u>Hu</u> with regard to Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over <u>Hayakawa</u>, <u>Hu</u>, and <u>Srinivasan</u> either alone or in proper combination.

13

Anderson and Gautam have been considered but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Hayakawa, Hu, and Srinivasan with regard to Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Hayakawa, Hu, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Gautam, either alone or in proper combination.

Independent Claims 7-12 recite features similar to those of Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-12 patentably distinguish over Hayakawa, Hu, Srinivasan, Anderson, and Gautam, either alone or in proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. Furthermore, the examiner is kindly invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the phone number below to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Sameer Gokhale
Registration No. 62,618

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)